

RAB Minutes

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MOUNTAIN VIEW CITY HALL, 4th FLOOR GALLERY  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041**

**Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES**

*NOTE: Glossary provided on the last page of these minutes.*

The former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on Thursday, 13 January 2005, at the Mountain View City Hall, fourth floor lobby, in Mountain View, California. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, the Lead Remedial Project Manager for Moffett Field, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. He was filling in for Ms. Andrea Espinoza, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator and Navy RAB Co-chair.

**Welcome**

Mr. Weissenborn welcomed everyone in attendance. This was followed by introductions. He informed those in attendance that photographs would be taken during the meeting. Since the photographs may be included in the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) brochure, he suggested RAB members sit at the opposite side of the room if they did not want to have their photographs taken. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB Community Co-chair, then explained changes to the agenda: the meeting would begin with a brief update on Site 29 (Hangar 1) and the regulatory update would be presented after the regularly scheduled presentations. The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

<b>RAB Members</b>	<b>Regulators</b>	<b>Navy</b>	<b>Contractors &amp; Navy Support</b>	<b>NASA</b>	<b>Public &amp; Other</b>
10	4	4	6	4	8

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Shelly Clubb, Chief of the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) Environmental Services Division, referred attendees to page 5 on the draft 18 November 2005 RAB meeting minutes. She noted that RAB member Paul Lesti wanted to know what the highest concentration levels were in Building N210, not Site 29 (Hangar 1), and her response to Mr. Lesti concerned Building N210, not Site 29 (Hangar 1).

Ms. Alana Lee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Project Manager for groundwater sites at Moffett Field, referred attendees to page 2 and noted that EPA is looking to other agencies to fund, not conduct, groundwater investigations at Orion Park Housing. Also, on page 3, her comments regarding informing the RAB about available copies of an EPA document referred to EPA's comments on the Navy's Draft Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study

(FS) Work Plan for Site 29 (Hangar 1), not the EPA's response to comments from various agencies in regards to the cleanup efforts at Site 29 (Hangar 1).

The minutes were adopted with the above changes.

**DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW** - Sign-up sheets for the following documents were circulated during the meeting.

#	Document Title	Approx. Submittal Date
1	Site 27 Draft Final Record of Decision (ROD)	Feb 2005
2	Draft Site 22 Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan Addendum	Mar 2005
3	Operable Unit (OU) 1 Five-Year Review Report Addendum	Winter 2005
4	Site 1 Final Post-Closure Long-Term Monitoring Plan	Winter 2005
5	East-Side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) Final Five-Year Review Report	Winter 2005
6	West-Side Aquifers Treatment Systems (WATS) Final Five -Year Review Report	Winter 2005
7	2003 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	Jan 2005
8	Fourth Quarter 2004/Annual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Reports for EATS and WATS	Jan 2005
9	WATS Optimization Work Plan Addendum	Feb 2005

## **RAB ELECTIONS**

Mr. Weissenborn explained that the RAB charter specifies nomination and election of a RAB Community Co-Chair every January. Mr. Moss was nominated by RAB member Jane Turnbull to continue to serve as the Moffett Field RAB Community Co-chair for 2005. He was unanimously re-elected by an oral vote.

## **SITE 29 (HANGAR 1) UPDATE**

Mr. Weissenborn provided a status on Site 29 (Hangar 1). He said the Navy has submitted a Draft RI/FS Work Plan to the agencies and public for review. The Navy has received 28 comments indicating concerns with the proposed site characterization approach, and is currently holding discussions with the agencies involved on how to address these issues. The Navy plans to publish its response to comments and the Draft Final RI/FS Work Plan on Monday, 17 January 2005. A comment negotiation period will take place from 17 January 2005 to 17 February 2005. Following this 30-day period, the document will either become final or the EPA and Regional Water Quality Control Board will invoke the formal dispute process provided in the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA).

### *Questions and Comments*

- In response to a community member's question about Site 29 (Hangar 1) being its own Superfund site, Ms. Lida Tan, EPA Project Manager for Sites 25 and 27, explained that Hangar 1 is a site within Moffett Field, the Superfund site. All of the sites within the Superfund site are numbered, and Hangar 1 is identified as Site 29. Mr. Weissenborn added that a site is considered a portion of Moffett Field, and sites are created for administrative and budgeting purposes. The same community member also wanted to know if there is a separate and parallel schedule for the investigation and publication of documents. Mr. Moss explained that each site is handled individually and has unique characteristics requiring different remediation methods. It is easier to handle each site individually rather than collectively. Remediation follows the FFA schedule for each site.
- In response to a comment from RAB member Richard Eckert about Site 29 (Hangar 1) being a major historical landmark that should be preserved and cleaned up completely, Mr. Weissenborn explained that the Navy is well aware of the importance of the building and is working toward resolution of the differences of opinion.

### **SITE 25 RI ADDENDUM**

Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy Remedial Project Manager for Sites 25 and 27, explained that his presentation was designed to provide a summary of what is in the Site 25 Draft Addendum to the Final Station-wide RI Report and might be helpful to those reviewing the document. The following Site 25 schedule was also presented:

- Draft RI Addendum - 30 November 2004
- Comment Period - 30 November 2004 to 29 January 2005
- Draft Final RI Addendum - March 2005
- Final RI Addendum - April 2005

Mr. Gromko provided background information about Site 25, including:

- Site 25 encompasses approximately 260 acres and is located in the northwest portion of Moffett Field, aiding in stormwater control.
- Sediment is of immediate concern. Stormwater carried contamination to the site. As water trickled through the Eastern Diked Marsh and into the Stormwater Retention Pond, the contamination precipitated out of the water and bonded to the sediment.

He explained the purpose of the RI Addendum:

- It adds on to a previous investigation, the Final Station-wide RI Report created in 1996.
- It is necessary because the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD) and NASA, the current property owners, would like to convert the site to a tidal marsh from a seasonal wetland. Local residents would also like to see the site become a tidal marsh.
- It will allow the Navy to collect the information needed to evaluate tidal marsh restoration without conducting a completely new RI. The Navy is also looking at new site data-samples collected in 2002 and 2003-to ensure conclusions drawn from data collected

previously are still accurate. NASA is also collecting additional data, which will be included in the Addendum.

Mr. Gromko said that the Navy is working collaboratively with EPA, San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), NASA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and MROSD to create the RI Addendum. He added that some of the items found in the RI Addendum include the nature and extent of the contamination, potential for human health and ecological risks and ecological receptors. Items not found in the RI Addendum that will be addressed in the FS Addendum include tidal marsh cleanup numbers, areas to be remediated and the configuration of Site 25 necessary to accommodate a tidal marsh.

### *Questions and Comments*

- In response to a question from a community member regarding the nature of the NASA data, Mr. Gromko explained that NASA has been looking at some of the historical operations and uses at various portions of the site to address any possible sources of contamination that may still be on the property. Ms. Clubb said Sandy Olliges from NASA would give a provisional update on the FS Addendum and tidal marsh land use scenario-similar to what was presented during the open house-during the March RAB meeting.
- In response to a question by a community member asking if the tidal marsh land use scenario is optional or preferred, Mr. Gromko explained it is optional. It is similar to Site 29 (Hangar 1) in that the Navy does not know what the preferred or remedial alternatives will be until the next stage is completed, which is the FS Addendum. Mr. Weissenborn explained that the RI Addendum is a way to incorporate data and associated risk assessments that were not included before into the RI. When the Navy does the FS Addendum, the land use scenario will be a tidal marsh.
- In response to a question from Ms. Turnbull regarding polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) located in the peninsula area, Don Chuck from NASA said the agency conducted a PCBs silver study for all of Moffett Field, which included the peninsula area because NASA found elevated levels of PCBs in the surface soils near that region. Ms. Clubb added that the report was released last week and still needed to be reviewed. She said NASA plans to do a Phase II investigation to define the overall status of the PCBs contamination. It also plans to remove PCBs from all of the NASA-owned portions of the base. NASA will be working with the Navy to discuss what to do about the PCBs that the Navy is responsible for remediating. Ms. Alana Lee suggested passing out a sign-up sheet if people would like to receive a copy of NASA's Phase II Draft Sampling and Analysis Plan. A sign-up sheet was passed around the room.
- In response to a question by Briggs Nisbet from Save the Bay regarding the reason why all of the PCBs contamination is not being removed since it poses a risk to the ecological receptors, Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy knows which species are most likely to be at risk and the FS Addendum will establish acceptable cleanup numbers. This will allow the Navy to remove contaminants present that are above the cleanup numbers and that pose a risk to the ecological receptors. Ms. Nisbet wanted to know if this means that some of the contaminants will remain at the site. Mr. Weissenborn explained that some of the contaminants will remain at the site, but only if they are at levels that do not pose a risk to

the ecological receptors.

- RAB member Lenny Siegel expressed appreciation to the Navy for doing an RI Addendum and NASA for issuing the 02 December 2004 letter regarding future land use of the site. He looks forward to seeing what Site 25 will look like in the future. He believes that all contamination at Site 25 should be cleaned up, not just some of the contamination, since the contamination comes from local sources.
- Mr. Siegel read a note listing comments written by Peter Strauss, Technical Assistant Grant Consultant for the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Strauss said in his note that he hopes the Navy understands the importance of reassessing the benthic organisms under the new scenario because many of the new ecological receptors are benthic organisms. He hopes the PCBs cleanup levels will be reduced to the original levels and not those based on the restricted habitat of the seasonal marsh. He hopes the habitat goal will be 1, not 10 or 100. He also said the RI Addendum assumes surface water under the tidal scenario is expected to consist of ambient water from the San Francisco Bay that is brought in with the tides and is not expected to consist of previously contaminated stormwater. He questions this assumption because tides will stir up sediments and release various contaminants. Mr. Siegel said Mr. Strauss would release more detailed comments in the future.
- In response to a question by RAB member Jeff Segall regarding whether a monitoring program will be in place after cleanup occurs to ensure there are no anticipated impacts to the ecological receptors, Mr. Weissenborn said that long-term monitoring will occur if any contamination is left in place. The goal is to remove contamination so that there is no risk, and there should be no reason to come back and do further remediation.
- Mr. Moss noted that in the future it could be discovered that ecological receptors may be more sensitive to contaminants than originally thought. If this happens then there may be some real problems.
- Mr. Siegel said this is not just a risk assessment, but also a risk management decision. He said it is not an absolute level of cleanup everyone is looking for, but a way to establish efficient and effective protections. The FS Addendum will propose a cleanup level and the public will have a chance to comment on it, once released.

## **REVISED DRAFT SITE CHARACTERIZATION WORK PLAN FOR ORION PARK HOUSING**

Mr. Larry Dudus, Project Manager for Tetra Tech FW, provided an update on the Revised Draft Site Characterization Work Plan for Orion Park Housing. He explained some of the site characterization data needs for the Orion Park Housing Area include investigating groundwater flow direction and the connection between shallow and deep aquifers, and determining the influence on Stevens Creek and potential on-site sources of contamination. Mr. Dudus provided the following background site information:

- In 1999, NASA detected trichlorethene (TCE) on the northern portion of Orion Park.
- In 2000, the Navy did some groundwater sampling along the southern boundary and detected TCE levels roughly the same as those detected along the northern boundary.
- In March and September 2002, the Navy conducted a Phase 1 and Phase 2 investigation which included collecting subsurface soil samples.

- In 2003, the Department of the Army collected additional groundwater information, primarily in the interchange area of Highway 101 and Moffett Boulevard.
- In November 2004, the Navy submitted the Revised Draft Site Characterization Work Plan for review.

During the investigations, there was an area where field screening indicated some elevated soil vapor concentrations. The Navy will go back to that site to collect additional soil samples for analysis. The other portion of the investigation involves:

- Collecting geologic and soil type data, groundwater samples and groundwater depth information at water-bearing zones in thirteen different locations
- Collecting soil samples for permeability evaluation at three groups of well pairs
- Installing a well in each of the shallow and deep groundwater zones, which will be used to collect samples and groundwater depth measurements
- Sampling the wells during the rainy and dry seasons in order to evaluate the influence of Stevens Creek on the local flow direction
- Collecting some information about a pump test conducted at each of these wells, allowing the Navy to evaluate how water and contaminants move through and between the aquifers

Another potential on-site source of contamination is a former farmhouse septic system. The Navy plans to locate the septic system, sample its contents, remove the tank and take additional soil samples below the tank and from the drain field, and sample groundwater up- and downgradient of the former farmhouse area. The Orion Park Housing schedule was also presented and is provided here:

- Revised Draft Site Characterization Work Plan - November 2004
- Comment Period - November 2004 to December 2004
- Address Comments - January 2005
- Final Work Plan - Spring 2005
- Fieldwork - Summer 2005
- Report Results - Winter/spring 2006

#### *Questions and Comments*

- Ms. Turnbull indicated that she was under the impression that the Navy had decided the Orion Park Housing contamination was coming from the potentially responsible parties south of 101. She asked if the Navy had a change in thinking. Mr. Weissenborn explained that the data shows that there is an off-site contamination source and the agencies and NASA feel there is an on-site Navy source as well. The Navy is investigating whether there is a Navy source.
- Mr. Siegel said the Navy needs to claim responsibility for cleaning up the site under Department of Defense (DOD) ownership until or unless another viable responsible party is found, as expressed in the FFA and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy has received Mr. Siegel's comments and is addressing the situation.

- Mr. Moss noted that no responsible party was found for a long time for a Superfund site near Palo Alto. However, Hewlett Packard took responsibility for site remediation in the meantime, as required by law. He said the Navy should follow Hewlett Packard's example. Some responsible parties were identified later on, such as Kodak, and were responsible for the costs associated with site cleanup. Mr. Weissenborn said that right now there is strong internal debate on the approach to take and that the data being collected is needed regardless of who is responsible for site cleanup.

## **REGULATORY UPDATE**

Ms. Lida Tan, outlined EPA's current activities as follows:

- EPA is reviewing the Site 25 Draft RI Addendum. She explained that although this document does not provide cleanup numbers, it does provide the scientific data needed to determine cleanup numbers. EPA can make recommendations on the cleanup numbers that can later be included in the FS Addendum.
- EPA is also reviewing the Site 27 Northern Channel ROD. EPA has no major disagreements on this document and is hoping that plans will move forward fairly smoothly.
- EPA does have major disagreements with the Site 29 (Hangar 1) RI/FS Work Plan. One major disagreement is the Navy's decision not to investigate the interior of Site 29 (Hangar 1). The second issue is the lead in the structure of the Hangar. EPA believes the Navy should include both of these in the Work Plan.

### *Questions and Comments*

- Ms. Lucas said she would like to see site cleanup at Site 27 completed in more than one phase in different locations since the Western Pond turtles need to be relocated for the cleanup. She believes they would have a better chance of survival this way. Ms. Tan explained the Navy is going to do a biological survey before cleanup takes place to pinpoint where the Western Pond turtles are located, so that if the turtles have moved to a new location, this can be addressed before cleanup occurs.

Ms. Lee outlined EPA's current activities as follows:

- EPA provided comments on the Revised Draft Site Characterization Work Plan for Orion Park Housing and the Moffett Community Housing Air Sampling Report. She said EPA's feels both reports are deficient in that they do not address the Navy's responsibility to conduct a full and complete RI and FS. In addition, she said the Navy's air sampling is insufficient and does not meet the objectives necessary to fully define the nature and extent of contamination and evaluate the appropriate remedial action alternatives necessary to clean up the site. EPA is also requesting that Orion Park Housing become a site - Site 30.

Ms. Adriana Constantinescu, Project Manager for RWQCB, outlined the agency's current activities:

- RWQCB also provided comments for the Revised Draft Site Characterization Work Plan for Orion Park Housing. She said RWQCB's comments related to the number of the proposed groundwater sampling points. RWQCB feels these points are not sufficient to

characterize an area of the dimensions of the Orion Park Housing Area. RWQCB recommends additional groundwater wells in the Orion Park Housing Area and that data be collected for each of these wells. This will provide better support on the interpretation of the subsurface and groundwater conditions. For the interpretation of the data, RWQCB recommends isotopic testing of the groundwater samples. RWQCB also recommends that more samples be taken from the septic tanks. She said she would like to e-mail the RAB on letters sent out on behalf of the RWQCB.

- RWQCB provided comments on the Site 27 Northern Channel ROD. RWQCB said additional data on the Western Pond turtles would be presented in the remedial design document issued in mid 2005. At this time, the Navy will present which areas within Site 27 will be excavated and during which season. The ROD is a legal document presenting mainly the remedial alternatives for Site 27.

### *Questions and Comments*

- In response to a question by Ms. Lucas regarding what isotopic testing entails, Ms. Constantinescu explained that specialized leads are measured in concentrations of carbon isotopes. This is a newer methodology, mainly used in Canada and France, and has been used in various Army and DOD sites and could bring in a better interpretation of the data.

### **RAB BUSINESS**

**RAB Schedule** - The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, 10 March 2005**, from **7 to 9:30 p.m.** at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor Gallery Area.

The RAB meeting schedule for 2005 is as follows:

- May 12, 2005
- July 14, 2005
- September 15, 2005
- November 17, 2005

**Future RAB Topics** - The following topics were identified for the next RAB meeting:

- NASA's Site 25 FS and Engineering Evaluation
- Site 29 (Hangar 1)

**RAB Related Announcements** - A public site tour is tentatively scheduled for May 12th to be followed by an abbreviated RAB meeting. Mr. Weissenborn requested that the RAB keep this date in mind.

**Adjourn** - Mr. Weissenborn adjourned the meeting at 9 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

Mr. Weissenborn may be contacted with any questions regarding environmental cleanup at

Moffett Field:

---

**Mr. Rick Weissenborn**

Lead Remedial Project Manager, former NAS Moffett Field  
Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
1220 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, California 92132-5190

**Telephone:** 619-532-0952

**Fax:** 619-532-0995

**E-mail:** [richard.weissenborn@navy.mil](mailto:richard.weissenborn@navy.mil)

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES**

BRAC - Base Realignment and Closure

CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

DOD - Department of Defense

EATS - East-side Aquifer Treatment System

EPA - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

FFA - Federal Facilities Agreement

FS - FS

IRP - Installation Restoration Program

MROSD - Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

NAS - Naval Air Station

NASA - National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NMAC - Northeast Mountain View Advisory Council

NPDES - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

O&M - Operation & Maintenance

OU - Operable Unit

PCBSS - polychlorinated biphenyls

RAB - Restoration Advisory Board

RI - Remedial Investigation

ROD - Record of Decision

RWQCB - California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region

TCE - Trichlorethene

WATS - West-side Aquifers Treatment System